

Revised and accepted by the Citizen Advisory Committee on January 21, 2016.

Meeting Summary

Citizen Advisory Committee – Comprehensive Plan Update

December 10, 2015 - 4:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.

Hillsboro Main Library – Board Room

2850 Brookwood Pkwy

Hillsboro, OR 97124

Members Present

Mica Annis, Steve Callaway, Aron Carleson, Wil Fuentes, John Godsey, Glenn Miller, Tricia Mortell, Daniel Nguyen, Ken Phelan

Members Excused

Katie Eyre, Bonnie Kookan, Mark Cardinaux, Ahne Oosterhof, Bryan Welsh

Staff Present

Nick Baker, Rob Dixon, Aaron Ray, Dan Rutzick, Laura Weigel

Welcome and Introductions

The meeting opened with introductions of the committee members and staff.

Minutes – November 19, 2015

The minutes were approved with no changes.

Recreation

Dan Rutzick reviewed the contents of the Recreation Background Report. The key issues and challenges identified in the report included:

- Private development of park spaces are not built to city standards
- Lack of indoor recreational facilities in the City
- New multi-family infill developments have limited yard sizes.
- Lack of financing for capital projects and maintenance of existing facilities.
- Reduction of chemical and water use in to maintain recreational facilities

Questions from the committee included:

- How does the Comprehensive Plan relate to program scholarships? Staff responded that scholarships are a programming issue, which is outside the scope of the Planning Department and the Comprehensive Plan.
- Why are we including policies related to designing facilities that address climate change, and should we use that term? Staff and committee members responded that designing parks—such as native landscaping—to consume fewer resources and reduce chemicals/pesticides reduces costs, and energy. Climate change will not be enumerated in policy language, but is more in the background. Staff will look at the specific policy language used to ensure that it is most effective -- staff may choose to utilize the term “resiliency” instead.
- How well are recreation facilities and opportunities dispersed across Hillsboro? Staff responded that most areas are reasonably well-served recreationally except for Northwest Hillsboro. Goals and policies will address both new development and address existing gaps.
- Will the proposed goals and policies related to co-location of schools and recreational facilities address private club uses? Staff responded that they would examine strengthening the draft goals and policies to accommodate such uses.

Staff then presented the key policy questions for the committee to consider, and the proposed goals and policies developed by staff. The key questions included:

- Should the city prioritize on-street active transportation connecting to recreation opportunities?
- Is an existing requirement for developers to landscape park-like features a recreation or urbanization policy?

Staff reviewed the policies under each goal with the committee and asked for input, suggestions, or questions. Staff explained that due to scheduling constraints, the Technical Advisory Committee had just reviewed these goals and policies earlier in the day, and that staff would share TAC feedback with CAC members.

The CAC’s feedback included:

- Goal 1: Plan, develop, and enhance recreation opportunities to meet the needs of community members of all ages, abilities, cultures, and incomes.
 - General discussion: Staff indicated that TAC members commented that there were a lack of policies that reflected different cultures and incomes, as stated in the goal. Staff will examine options to better incorporate these aspects.
 - Policy 1.3: The committee suggested addition of “social connectiveness”.
 - Policy 1.4: The committee asked if this language included the Beaverton School District, as part of Hillsboro is served by that district. Staff responded that it does.
 - Policy 1.5: Committee members discussed whether “partner” may be a stronger term than “coordinate”, but ultimately opted to leave the policy as written as “partner” may imply some sort of cost-sharing arrangement.
- Goal 2: Create a citywide network of safe, interconnected recreation opportunities.

- Policy 2.1: Staff indicated that based on TAC feedback, this policy will be modified slightly to include improved on-street bike lanes and paths, and to improve access to parks.
- Policy 2.4: CAC members recommended including emergency access in the planning and design of greenways, open space, and trails.
- Goal 3: Strive for recreation opportunities that preserve and promote ecological health.
 - General discussion: Committee members asked about policies related to earthquakes and natural hazards. Staff indicated that these issues will be addressed in their own topic with specific goals and policies later in the project.
- Goal 4: Optimize funding for land acquisition, recreation development, operations, and maintenance.
 - General discussion: Staff stated that a discussion with Development Services staff will take place to craft policy language allowing developers to pay fees to improve/develop nearby park space in lieu of requirement to build park space on their developments. Staff also indicated that input has been previously received supporting the development of a street tree ordinance.
 - Policy 4.1: Committee members felt that the policy was vague. Staff indicated that they would examine the language.
 - Policy 4.2: The committee discussed whether “current city standards” might be more specific about which standards would apply to developer-built facilities. Staff responded that “current” may be a bit vague, but that they would look at ways to make this policy more specific.
 - Policy 4.3: Staff commented that this policy may be moved to the transportation section instead.

Staff said that revisions based on this and TAC feedback would be provided to the CAC in a future packet.

Housing Draft Goals & Policies

Aaron Ray reintroduced the Housing draft goals and policies, continuing the discussion from the November CAC meeting. The group reviewed through policy 3.5 at the previous meeting and started reviewing at 3.6. Goals and policies included in this month’s packet reflect feedback from the last meeting. Aaron also shared additional feedback from the TAC, including concerns that the policies and goals didn’t adequately reflect the middle of the market but focused on the high and low income segments. Also, TAC members felt that policy language was a bit vague and tended to shift from the very general to the very specific sporadically. Staff also reminded the committee that the Housing Needs Analysis Subcommittee had reviewed the draft goals and policies.

Prior to discussion of goals and policies, committee members asked why policy 1.5 was removed. Staff answered that it was moved to policy 2.3.

Discussion of goals and policies began with policy 3.6. Feedback from the committee included:

- Goal 3: Foster distinct and vibrant districts and neighborhoods that serve the daily needs of nearby residents that are safely accessible by walking, biking, transit or a short commute.
 - Policy 3.6: The committee asked what impact mitigation specified in this policy might look like. Staff responded that it allows for individual review of specific developments to determine the right measures specific to the site, such as design modifications or landscape buffering, rather than requiring uniform standards that don't address site-specific conditions.
 - Policy 3.7: Staff indicated that based on TAC feedback, this policy may be split into one covering facilities, and one covering specific uses. Staff will work with Development Services to craft this language. Committee members asked if home occupations could be defined, and whether they would include things like Airbnb. Staff responded that there is a specific definition from the CDC that can be used.
 - Policy 3.8: The committee asked if there are other historically valuable areas besides downtown. Staff responded that Orenco is historically designated, and that the term "historical" is relative—anything older than 50 years old is technically a historic resource.
 - Policy 3.9: The committee suggested adding a phrase such as "compatible with the surrounding area" so that infill is not out of character with the neighborhood. Staff responded that this is an important consideration, but might function better as a separate policy. Staff will look into this.
 - Policy 3.10: Staff noted that "environmental design" needs a definition.
- Goal 4: Ensure that the city has an adequate housing supply with enough land to support future growth.
 - Policy 4.2: The committee asked if this policy could be used against the city by homeowners. Staff responded that they felt comfortable with this language. The committee then asked if the staff has considered the impact on schools when designating areas for development. Staff responded that input from the affected stakeholder jurisdictions is vital to the decision-making process and policy implementation. Additionally, staff was unsure to what extent a development can be denied due to a school capacity issue.
 - Policy 4.3: The committee suggested specifically mentioning schools in this policy.
 - Policy 4.4: Staff indicated that Development Services depends on the specific phrasing of this policy as written and has requested no additional changes. This policy comes verbatim from the current Comprehensive Plan.
 - Policy 4.5: Staff explained the Planned Unit Development process in broad terms to the committee, and indicated that while this policy is broad, it also has a high level of oversight built into it. Staff indicated that the term Planned Unit Development would be defined.
 - Policy 4.8: Committee members asked for the definition of a "Station Community Planning Area District". Staff explained that these are basically the areas around MAX stations, but that a specific definition would be included.
- Goal 5: Encourage innovative architectural and site design in planning and developing housing.

- Policy 5.3: Staff clarified that terms such as “tiny houses” and “cottages” would be defined. Committee members asked about the term “ancillary” as opposed to “auxiliary” or “accessory” dwelling unit. Staff responded that “accessory” is specifically defined in the current Community Development Code.
- Goal 6 - Encourage sustainable practices in planning and developing housing.
 - Policy 6.5: The committee asked why this was considered an “emerging” practice considering that some of these approaches are already used. Staff responded that future decisions that want to expand their use of these approaches could be covered by this policy.

Staff then discussed next steps for the Housing Topic. The Planning Commission will review HNA findings and draft Goals and Policies in worksessions in January and February. The committee wanted to know at what point the City Council would review these materials; staff responded that the standard process for review is to gather feedback from the Planning Commission, followed by a Community Summit, and then a City Council work session. Members of the committee suggested that City Council review may be appropriate earlier in the process, and staff agreed to investigate options in this regard.

Access to Local Food – Background Report and Draft Goals & Policies

Laura Weigel introduced the Access to Local Food topic. This topic is not required under statewide planning goals, but community input gathered in the Hillsboro 2035 Community Plan process indicated that this is an important topic for the community that should be addressed. Planning staff worked with Parks and Recreation staff to develop the background report and draft goals and policies. This topic addresses, community gardens, urban agriculture opportunities, open space requirements, and incentives for community gardening.

Staff discussed some of the feedback received from the TAC and indicated that this section would be revised following this TAC/CAC review cycle for additional review at the January meeting. Staff also relayed the TAC recommendation to remove the term “healthy” in the topic title as it some people felt that it was too loaded a term. [Staff note: the topic has since been renamed “Access to Locally-Grown Food”.]

CAC members provided additional feedback, including:

- Goal 1 – Improve access to healthy, locally-grown food for community members of all ages, abilities, cultures, and incomes.
 - General discussion: Some, but not all, committee members concurred with the decision to remove the word “healthy”.
 - Policy 1.1: The committee suggested changing “Coordinate with” to “Partner with”
 - Policy 1.3: Staff commented that this language needed to be refined to clarify the intent of this policy.
 - Policy 1.4: The committee requested that staff clarify and/or define “local food production”.

Staff concluded the review and indicated that revised goals and policies would be included in the January meeting materials.

Upcoming Meeting Schedules and Topics

Staff reminded the committee that the next meeting will be held January 21, 2016, one week early due to a conflict with the State of the City address. The February and March meetings will also be held one week early due to conflicts.

Public Comment

No members of the public offered comment at the meeting.

Adjournment

With no additional business to consider, the CAC meeting was adjourned.